



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,102	06/22/2006	Heimo Scheucher	AT03 0069 US1	1416
65913	7590	02/27/2008	EXAMINER	
NXP, B.V. NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY DRIVE SAN JOSE, CA 95131			CHU, CHRIS C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/27/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/584,102	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SCHEUCHER, HEIMO	
	<b>Examiner</b> CHRIS C. CHU	<b>Art Unit</b> 2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/22/06</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 1 and 2 are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - (A) In claim 1, lines 22 – 24, “wherein a first control module field of each exposure field” should be -- wherein a first control module field of the at least two control module fields within each of the exposure field-- because the sentence contains a plurality of antecedent basises.
  - (B) In claim 1, lines 27 – 28, “wherein a second control module field of each exposure field” should be -- wherein a second control module field of the at least two control module fields within each of the exposure field-- because the sentence contains a plurality of antecedent basises.
  - (C) In claim 2, lines 1 – 3, “wherein the second control module field of each exposure field” should be -- wherein the second control module field of the at least two control module fields within each of the exposure field-- because the sentence contains a plurality of antecedent basises.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- (A) In claim 1, line 25, it is not clear what applicant regards as “wherein a first control module field of each exposure field immediately adjoins the first edge of the exposure field in question”. Specifically, the term “question” in the claims is not clear because the term “question” does not indicate any specific location of the first control module field within the exposure field. Thus, the Examiner is not sure a specific location that should be indicated by the term “question”.
- (B) In claim 2, line 5, it is not clear what applicant regards as “wherein the second control module field of each exposure field immediately adjoins ... the exposure field in question”. Specifically, the term “question” in the claims is not clear because the term “question” does not indicate any specific location of the second control module field within the exposure field. Thus, the Examiner is not sure a specific location that should be indicated by the term “question”.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected as explained in the above paragraphs, but would be allowable if rewritten or corrected the above problems.

- (A) Claim 1 contains allowable subject matter because none of references of record teach or suggest, either singularly or in combination, at least the limitation of at least two control module fields are assigned to each exposure field, each of which

control module fields contains at least one optical control module ... wherein a second control module field ... lies at a preset distance from the second edge between two rows of lattice fields extending parallel to the first direction and arranged adjacent to one another, and thus likewise in a first dicing path.

- (B) Since claim 2 is a dependent claim of rejected claim 1, hence this claim is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim, any intervening claims and correcting the 112 2<sup>nd</sup> problem as explained in the above paragraphs.

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cowles et al., Van Arendonk et al., Shimizu et al., Chao et al., Aurenium, Talanov et al. and Smith et al. disclose a wafer with semiconductor devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRIS C. CHU whose telephone number is (571)272-1724. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:30 - 8:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Parker can be reached on 571-272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Chris C. Chu  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2815

/Chris C. Chu/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2815  
Monday, February 18, 2008